

## Interview Summary

Application No.  
10/038,177

Applicant(s)  
Craig et al.

Examiner  
Joyce Tung

Art Unit  
1637



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Joyce Tung

(3) Lisa Wilson

(2) Joseph Koipally

(4) Mary Rose Scozzafava

Date of Interview Nov 6, 2003

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic      b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes      e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: \_\_\_\_\_

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_\_

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

discussed the differences between the prior art and the instant invention.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required